Application No.: 10/829,311 Response to Office Action of January 3, 2007 10 Docket No.: 249212026300

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to Figure 1.

Submitted herewith is one sheet of replacement drawing, Figure 1, for filing in the above-identified Patent application.

Attachment:

Replacement sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are rejected, and claims 10-22 were previously withdrawn. By virtue of this response, claims 1, 7-9 are amended, and claims 10-22 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are currently under consideration. No new matter was added. Amendment of subject matter is not to be construed as an abandonment of any subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claims 6-9 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, subject matter related to claims 7-9 are incorporated into base claim 1.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to for allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include one or more reference signs mentioned in the description, and they include one or more reference signs not mentioned in the description.

In response, Figure 1 is amended to correctly identify element number 107, and paragraphs [0028], [0033], [0037], and [0038] are amended. No new matter is added.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not within the range of 50-150 words. In response, the abstract has been amended to be within the range of 50-150 words.

The disclosure is objected to because "front wall 220" should be changed to "front wall 210", in line 3 of paragraph [0021], to be consistent with the remainder of the disclosure. In response, appropriate correction has been made to paragraph [0021].

Application No.: 10/829,311 12 Docket No.: 249212026300

Response to Office Action of January 3, 2007

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response, claim 1 has been appropriately amended. Applicants respectfully submit claim 1, and dependent claims 2-9, which inherited the indefiniteness associated with claim 1, are now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ozawa (US 5,067,036) ("Ozawa").

In response, claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things, "a media flag movably coupled to the receiver and translatable from a first position to a second position when the storage media device is inserted into the receiver, wherein the media flag comprises an insertion depth measure for identifying a media type; a media flag sensor fixedly coupled to the drive base for detecting movement of the media flag; a receiver flag fixedly coupled to the receiver, wherein the receiver flag comprises a distance measure for determining if the storage media device is in the loaded position; and a receiver flag sensor fixedly coupled to the drive base for detecting movement of the receiver flag."

In contrast, Ozawa discloses a cassette holder for detecting two different positions during the loading/unloading sequences to track the position of the cassette. This is disclosed in the following paragraph:

Application No.: 10/829,311 13 Docket No.: 249212026300

Response to Office Action of January 3, 2007

In order to overcome the above-described problem, there is provided a cassette loading mechanism comprising means for detecting that a cassette holder reaches a specific position in a passage arranged between a first position to which a cassette is inserted and a second position at which the cassette is loaded, with the detection being made during the movement of the cassette holder from the second position to the first position, whereby a driving member for moving the cassette holder is controlled in accordance with an output from the detection means and the cassette holder is stopped at the specific position. (Emphasis added). (Col. 1, lines 57-68).

Moreover, in Figures 2 and 3, the sensor arms 20 and 21 rotate to detect the cassette in different positions, in col. 8, lines 25-36 as follows:

When the photo-sensor 33 has been shifted to the light stopped state, the motor 36 is driven in the direction of the arrow A (FIG. 1) and the cassette holder 4 moves in the direction as designated by an arrow in FIG. 4. Accordingly, the sensor arms 20 and 21 rotate in a clockwise direction as described with reference to FIGS. 2 and 3 so that the photosensors 24 and 25 are brought into the light shielded state. When the cassette holder 4 is lowered perpendicularly after it has moved horizontally, the sensor arm 19 comes contact with the rear surface of the large cassette 1 and then it further rotates in a clockwise direction. (Emphasis added).

Therefore, Ozawa at least fails to disclose or suggest "a media flag movably coupled to the receiver and translatable from a first position to a second position when the storage media device is inserted into the receiver, wherein the media flag comprises an insertion depth measure for identifying a media type" and "a receiver flag fixedly coupled to the receiver, wherein the receiver flag comprises a distance measure for determining if the storage media device is in the loaded position," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit claim 1 is allowable over Ozawa.

Therefore, claims 2-3 and 5, each of which is dependent from claim 1, is allowable over Ozawa. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5.

Application No.: 10/829,311 14 Docket No.: 249212026300

Response to Office Action of January 3, 2007

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ozawa.

For at least the reasons given above for claim 1, claim 4, which is dependent from claim 1, is allowable over Ozawa. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 4.

Application No.: 10/829,311 15 Docket No.: 249212026300

Response to Office Action of January 3, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. <u>03-1952</u> referencing docket no. <u>249212026300</u>. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Denise H. Wong

Registration No.: 59,622 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6221